REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the instant case in view of the instant response. Claims 1-21 remain pending in the case. Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18 and 19 have been amended herein. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5, 8-12, and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by MacFarlane et al., U.S. Patent Appl. Pub. No. 2001/0042081, hereafter referred to as MacFarlane. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation "wherein said information is associated with a commerce transaction" and the limitation "and only transaction specific information is retained." Claim 1 has been further amended to include the limitation "filtering based only on said information." Independent Claims 8 and 15 recite similar limitations. The embodiment of the present invention, as claimed, is not taught or suggested by MacFarlane.

The present invention, filters information based only on the information retrieved rather than filtering based on outside inputs such as physical characteristics of specific electronic devices, such as MacFarlane (page 2,

paragraph 0021). MacFarlane teaches away from the present invention by filtering based on outside information.

Furthermore, MacFarlane teaches removing markup depending on physical characteristics of the device, user preferences and transmission link characteristics (page 5, paragraph 0071). However, MacFarlane fails to teach or suggest selective filtering wherein only commerce related information is retained and "based only on the information retrieved," as claimed. MacFarlane is silent about filtering commerce related information.

MacFarlane teaches away from the claimed embodiment of the invention by filtering based on outside inputs (e.g., physical characteristics of the device, transmission link characteristics, etc.), where as embodiments of the present invention filter based only on the content of the information retrieved. For this rational, Independent Claims 1, 8 and 15 are not anticipated by MacFarlane and allowance of Claims 1, 8 and 15 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-5 depend from independent Claim 1 and include all of the limitations of Claim 1, Claims 9-12 depend from independent Claim 8 and include all of the limitations of Claim 8 and Claims 16-19 depend from independent Claim 15 and include all of the limitations of Claim 15. As such, Claims 1-5, 8-12 and

15-19 are not anticipated by MacFarlane and allowance of Claims 1-5, 8-12 and

15-19 is earnestly solicited.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6-7, 13-14 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacFarlane in view of Fetcher et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,138,156, hereafter referred to as Fletcher. The rejection is traversed for the following rational.

For the reasons presented above, MacFarlane fails to teach or suggest embodiments of the present invention, as claimed. Specifically, MacFarlane fails to teach or suggest "filtering based only on the information retrieved," "retrieving information associated with a transaction," and "filtering information based on a transaction," as claimed.

Fletcher fails to remedy the deficiencies of MacFarlane. Applicants respectfully note that the Fletcher fails to teach or suggest the present invention that includes assessing the information to determine the transaction type by matching the information against a predefined set of transaction-specific tags, as claimed in independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 of the present invention.

In contrast to independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 of the present invention, Fletcher discloses a method and system for selecting and applying content reducing filters based on dynamic environmental factors to filter the content being delivered from a server to a user's workstation. Specifically, Fletcher describes content transformation that reduces the size of the data through a transformation

that takes into account dynamic environmental factors. The reduced content is returned to the user's workstation in response to a request for web content. As such, Fletcher discloses content reduction through filters that are selected based on environmental factors. However, Fletcher fails to teach or suggest any process for determining the transaction type of the content for determining the filtration process, as in the present invention.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention as disclosed in independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 is patentable over MacFarlane in view of Fletcher and is in a condition for allowance. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 6-7 which depend from independent Claim 1 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 13-14 which depend from independent Claim 8 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim. Also, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 20-21 which depend from independent Claim 15 are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the amended Claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-21 overcome the rejections and objections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-21 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that a discussion would expedite prosecution of the instant case, the Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: 9/25, 2005

John P. Wagner
Registration No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060